G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—20 12 13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

19D/-02
(Munzrai)

File No. 100

Serial Nos. 1—8

Papers Filed.

Month ~~January 1908~~ March 1907

SUBJECT.

Passes orders in the matter of restoration of Kayamgutta Inam Hanumenahalli Village endowed to the Sri Anjaneya Swamy at Hanumenahalli Village, Siddaghatta

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

Inwz 7-77 of 1894

LATER REFERENCES.

Inwz 7 306 of 1907
510 of 1911

1914-21

Inwz 273-26-1-8

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE NOTE. Sl 1

Subject.

Inre restoration of the Kaipuna, the ma-
village of Hammenhalli attached to the Sri Anjaneya
temple there which was resumed.

LAST REFERENCE:—

Letter No. 1534 - dated 31st.
157

August 1904 from the Dy Commissioner
Kolar District.

On the petn of one Kaddi Vasudeva Char of Siddaghatta in 1894,
it was reported that Four survnos in Chandasandra village
and the entire village of Hammenhalli
were reported to be "Devadaya" lands
endowed to the Sri Anjaneyaswami Temple
at Siddaghatta. The Archakas of
the temple were found guilty of
neglect of duty & breach of trust
in respect of temple property.
it was proved that they had alienated
the inams, the lands were directed
be resumed & placed under Govt's management

Pls A

Printed copy of Pro
-up which clearly
explains the facts
before Govt:-

The Dy Commr reports that there are 2 temples of Anjaneyaswamy, that one of them which is in Sidhaghatta Kasba is endowed with 4 Svs Nos referred to in the Govt order of the 17th December 1897 & that the other is in Hanumanthapura village but which the village has been endowed. A mistake is made in the issue of the Govt order above referred to directing the resumption of the inams & placing them under Govt management The Dy Commr in the clearly explains the facts of the case & submits with a draft of proceedings the recommendation of the Dy Commr.

Submitted to the Dewan through the Sec 2(?) 8/12/04

Draft approved 20/12/04

Chamarajendra 21.12.04

30/9/04 Rs 1/10/04

209/8-12-04.

24/9/07

SL 3

OFFICE ... Date ... REC. No 288 ... MUZRAI DEPT

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] — — —

[illegible]

[illegible] — — —

[illegible]

[illegible]

4 [illegible] — — —

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] — —

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] — —

[illegible] 24 —

[illegible] 10 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (ಬಿ) — (ಬಿ)

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಆನೇಕಲ್ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂರ್ಯಕಾಂತಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಧನ ನೀಡುವ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೃಷಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕೃಷಿ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿದೇವಿ ಅವರು ಮಾಹಿತಿ ನೀಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯಡಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಗರಿಷ್ಠ 2 ಹೆಕ್ಟೇರ್ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯಧನ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಹೆಕ್ಟೇರ್‌ಗೆ ₹ 6,000 ರಂತೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ₹ 12,000 ಸಹಾಯಧನ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಆಸಕ್ತ ರೈತರು ಆಧಾರ್ ಕಾರ್ಡ್, ಪಹಣಿ ಪತ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಪಾಸ್‌ಬುಕ್ ಜೆರಾಕ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ 15 ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 2025 ಆಗಿದೆ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ರೈತರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹೋಬಳಿ ಕೃಷಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುವ ರೈತರು ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 15 ರೊಳಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅವಧಿಯ ನಂತರ ಬಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಮೀಪದ ರೈತ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಕೇಂದ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುವ ರೈತರು ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 15 ರೊಳಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅವಧಿಯ ನಂತರ ಬಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಮೀಪದ ರೈತ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಕೇಂದ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಆನೇಕಲ್ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂರ್ಯಕಾಂತಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಧನ ನೀಡುವ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೃಷಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕೃಷಿ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿದೇವಿ ಅವರು ಮಾಹಿತಿ ನೀಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯಡಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಗರಿಷ್ಠ 2 ಹೆಕ್ಟೇರ್ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯಧನ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಹೆಕ್ಟೇರ್‌ಗೆ ₹ 6,000 ರಂತೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ₹ 12,000 ಸಹಾಯಧನ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಆಸಕ್ತ ರೈತರು ಆಧಾರ್ ಕಾರ್ಡ್, ಪಹಣಿ ಪತ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಪಾಸ್‌ಬುಕ್ ಜೆರಾಕ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ 15 ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 2025 ಆಗಿದೆ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ರೈತರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹೋಬಳಿ ಕೃಷಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುವ ರೈತರು ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 15 ರೊಳಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅವಧಿಯ ನಂತರ ಬಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಮೀಪದ ರೈತ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಕೇಂದ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಆನೇಕಲ್ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂರ್ಯಕಾಂತಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಧನ ನೀಡುವ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೃಷಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕೃಷಿ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿದೇವಿ ಅವರು ಮಾಹಿತಿ ನೀಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯಡಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಗರಿಷ್ಠ 2 ಹೆಕ್ಟೇರ್ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯಧನ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಹೆಕ್ಟೇರ್‌ಗೆ ₹ 6,000 ರಂತೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ₹ 12,000 ಸಹಾಯಧನ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಆಸಕ್ತ ರೈತರು ಆಧಾರ್ ಕಾರ್ಡ್, ಪಹಣಿ ಪತ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಪಾಸ್‌ಬುಕ್ ಜೆರಾಕ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ 15 ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 2025 ಆಗಿದೆ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ರೈತರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹೋಬಳಿ ಕೃಷಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುವ ರೈತರು ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 15 ರೊಳಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅವಧಿಯ ನಂತರ ಬಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಮೀಪದ ರೈತ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಕೇಂದ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಕನಲ್ಲಿ

[illegible]

1882 [illegible] 5 [illegible] 7704-12-234

[illegible]

[illegible] 1882 [illegible] 24 [illegible] 3857-65-100

[illegible]

[illegible] 24-9-1901 [illegible]

[illegible]

(٥)

MUZDAA

Rev.-Judl., Serial No. 7.

1ನೇ ನಂಬರಿನ ನಮೂನೆ.

ತಗಾದೇ ನೋಟೀಸ್.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಛೇರಿ

ಗೆ ತಗಾದೇ ನೋಟೀಸ್.

(29)

188 4 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳ 15 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿಗೆ ಪೊರೈಸಿದ 1884 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ತಿಂಗಳ ವಿನ್ಸಗೆ ನೇ ನಂಬರು ಪಟ್ಟೀದಾರನಾದ ನಿನ್ನಿಂದ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವದರಿಂದ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಲ್ದಾರು ನಿನಗೆ ತಗಾದೇ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಮತ್ತು ಈ ನೋಟೀಸು ಜಾರೀ ಆದ ತಾರೀಖು ಲಾಗಾಯತು 15 ದಿವಸಗಳು ಒಳಗಾಗಿ ಸದರೀ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ನೀನು ಪಾವತೀ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಮೇಲೆ ನಮೂದಾದ ಪಾಯಿದೇ ಒಳಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಬಾಕೀಯನ್ನು ಸಂದಾಯ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಸಂದಾಯ ಮಾಡದೇ ಯಿರುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಾದ ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿರದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಾಕೀಗೆ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ನಿನ್ನ ಚರ ಯಾ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಮೆತ್ತಾಗಮಾಡಿಯಾದರು ನೋಟೀಸಿನ ಖರ್ಚಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹರಾಜು ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಡುವದು

ಜಪ್ತಿಯ ಭತ್ತೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ 1 ರೂ ಅಷ್ಟೊಳನ್ನು ನೀನು ಈಗ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಮಲ್ದಾರ್.

ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ.— ಈ ನೋಟೀಸು ಜಾರೀ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನೇಮಕವಾಗಿರುವ ಮನುಷ್ಯನು ಸರಕಾರಿ ಬಾಕೀ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿಡಿದ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅವನ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಸಾಲೆಕ್ಟ್ಯನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವನ ಕುಟುಂಬಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಪ್ರಬುದ್ಧನಾದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಗಂಡಸಿಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಅಕ್ಕನ ಮುಕ್ತಾರೀಕನಿಗೆ ಈ ನೋಟೀಸು ನಕಲನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು, ಆಥವಾ ತೆರೆದ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಯಬಂದ ಅವನ ನಾಸನ್ಯಾನದ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಯಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಜಿನಿಸಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾದ ಸ್ಥಳದೊಳಗೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ನಕಲನ್ನು ಜಿತಟಾಯಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಜಾರೀ ಆಗುವೆನ್ನೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಟೀಸು ಜಾರೀ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಮನುಷ್ಯನು ನೋಟೀಸು ಮೇಲೆ ಪರಾ ಬರೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—10-2-83.—91,000.

MUZRAI

1901 Sl 2

From by
THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

To
The Deputy Commr.,
Kolar District

Dated 13th July 1901.
Despatched 15th
Received
General No. 104 & 105
Muzrai F. No. 46 — 98
Enclosure No. 28 one

Has the honor to forward herewith Petition no. 21, dated 3rd July 1901, from one Khadri Vasudevachar, Archak of the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Sidlaghatta.

2. In inviting the Deputy Commissioner's attention to para 2 of Govt Pro: No. 718, dated 17th December 1897, ~~the undersigned is to~~ states that no report has yet been received in this office regarding the assumption of the management of the temple and its Inam lands. This must

be expedited

3 Again in para 3 of the same Govt order, it is distinctly laid down that a limit will be specified for the suspension of the Archaks after the temple is restored". It is now nearly 4 years since the Order was passed, and yet no estimate has been submitted for the repairs needed to the temple, to enable Govt to specify the period of the suspension of the Archaks. This is to be repeated The Deputy Commissioner is now requested to submit without further delay the Estimate, together with the report called for in para 2 supra

4. The petitioner, however states that repairs have been already carried out to the temple If so, a report on this point is also awaited

By order

12/7/14

Dy Secretary

Ord 105 dy 13.7.01.

Encl to letter dt stating that a report has been called for from DC

MUZRAI

1901

From

The Dy Secretary

To

Muzrai Department

The Dy Commr,

Dated 16th Kolar District

Despatched October

Received

General No. 581 & 582

Muzrai F. No. 46-98

Enclosure No.

This Office Docket No. 104 dated 13th July 1901, Muz F 46-98 calling for a report regarding the assumption of the management of the Sri Anjaneyaswami Temple and its Inam lands at Sidlaghatta

Has the honour to draw attention to the above and to request the early submission of the report and the Estimate thereon

MGCPB—11-1-1901—1500

therein called for

2. The Dy Commissioner is requested to submit the entire records connected with the alienation of the Inam endowed to this temple, as the same is required for of a memorial received from the advocate Venkataramanayya —

Dy Comm 16/10/01

Dy Secy

for

No 5-82

Encl to the petn Venkataramanayya : —

In reply to his petn no 288 dated 24th September 1901, the petnr is informed that the records in connection with the — of the Inam lands attached to the Anjaneyaswami at Kolaghatta, have been called for from the Dy Comm that the matter would be disposed of in due course

Reminder

MUZRAI

1901

From

To The Dy Com^r
Kolar District

Dated 7th May
Despatched 7th April 1902

Received

General No. 1736.
Muzrai F. No. 46-98
Enclosure No. 1

In continuation of ~~this Office~~ docket No. 104 Muzrai 46-98 Dy 13th July 1901, calling for a report regarding the assumption of the management of the Sri Anjaneya Swami temple and its Inam lands and subsequent reminder marginally noted,

No. 581 Dy 16. 10. 1901. Muzrai 46-98

I ~~has~~ has the honor to ~~draw~~ attention to the above and to request the submission of the report with the entire records connected

forwarded herewith

matter petitions on 9th Dy 14th April 1902, and

Venkatanarayana

MGCPB—11-1-1901—1500

with the case and also the Estimate thereon called for.

R. O.

Dft

Dy Secy.

Int Interior Depart.

Encl: to the Petrs:

and to request that the submissions of the report and the records herein called for may be expedited without any further delay.

1010

...TAI SECRET...

Sl 5

From

The Deputy Commissioner

Kolar District

To

The Deputy Secretary

to Government

Inspn Department

Bangalore

H C

Submitted with a short office note & draft for the reasons

Dated 31st August 1904

Despd: 7-9-04.

No. 1534/157 Encl: 1 file (171 papers)

Reporting on the assumption of the management of the Sri Anjaneyaswami Temple and its Inam lands at Siddlaghatta

Bed

Wr/Nov

W

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kolar District
Dated 31st August 1904

From

M. C. Pittannalchetty Esquire
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To,

S. Srinivasaraya Rao Esqr.
Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Inam Department

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 104/46-98 dated 13th July 1901, calling for a report regarding the assumption of the management of the Sri Arjunaswamy Temple and its inam lands at Siddaghatta and subsequent Nos. 581 and 1736 dated 16th October 1901, and 7th May 1902, respectively, requesting to submit the entire records connected with the case for the disposal of a memorial received from

from the alienee, Srinthee Venkata
ramanappa, I have the honor
to submit herewith the entire records
connected with the case, from which
it will be seen that the needful
repairs to the Anjanegasvami Temple
at Siddaghatta have been executed
as per estimate sanctioned in your
docket No. 622 dated 30th November
1899 and that pooja is being regularly
performed therein.

2. As regards the assumption of
the management of the Inam lands,
attached to the Temple which were
alienated by the Archaks, it is now
reported that out of 4 Survey nos
in the Chowdasandra Village assi-
gned as Inams to the Temple at
Siddaghatta; Survey No: 151 having
been alienated prior to Chief
Commissioner's notification dated
31st January 1863, it has since
been subjected to a jodi of half
the assessment which is now
being

being paid to the institution direct,
and that the remaining 3 numbers
have been resumed from the alienees
and restored to the temples and that
they are now under Government
management in accordance with
Government order No. 718 dated
14th December 1897.

3. In this connection I beg to
bring to your notice that from
the beginning a mistake has been
made with regard to the Hagawa-
-gatta Village of Hanumanahalli,
which is also under attachment
and management of Government.

4. There were two Anjaneya's temples,
one in the Siddaghatta Kasba, and
the other, in the Village of Hanumana
-halli which is at a distance of
2 miles from Siddaghatta. One
and the same pujari was performa-
-ing puja in both those temples
and was enjoying the Inam lands

endowed

endowed to both. Some time ago a pujari of these temples seems to have alienated these lands.

5. Hanumanahalli is a Kayamgutta Village endowed to the temple of Anjaneyaswamie at Hanumana -halli Village and not to that at Siddaghatta Kasba. A kind perusal of the title deed No $\frac{146}{12}$ dated 1st October 1880 (filed in the record as Serial No: 40), will show that this Village was confirmed as Kayam -gutta Village in favor of the temple of Anjaneyadevaroo at Hanumana -halli. In the printed copy of the quit-rent register, it is noted that this inam was originally a personal one, but subsequently treated as "Devadaya".

6. As these facts were not known at the time when this office reference No. $\frac{3479}{827}$ dated 3rd March 1897

was

was made, it was recommended by the then Deputy Commissioner that this Village also might be brought under Government management, probably under the belief that it was an inam Village endowed to the temple at Siddaghatta. The Government have accordingly passed orders and the same is now under Government management along with the other lands of the temple at Siddaghatta.

7. How this mistake arose, it is not possible to say at this distance of time, but it might be rightly inferred that as both the temples were dedicated to the Deity of the same name and as one pujari was performing pooja in both the temples, the authorities, without holding proper enquiries in the matter, might have included this Village also as one endowed to the temple at Siddaghatta. If the Taluk

authorities

authorities had taken pains to see the Inam Title deeds and the quit Rent Register, this mistake would not have crept in. Whatever may might have been the cause of this error, it is a mistake which has now to be rectified in the light of the facts now brought to notice.

8. Before the resumption of this Village by Government, it was in the possession and enjoyment of Muthen Venkatasamanappa in whose favor the Arehalli had alienated the Village, and he was paying to Government a quitta amounting of Rs 24, per annum; but Subsequent to its resumption, the annual income of the Village does not even cover the Government dues, as will be seen from the fact that a Sum of Rs 49-10-9 is still due to Government in the shape of quitta amount for the period during

which

which it has been under Govern
ment management. This is neither
advantageous to Government,
nor of benefit to the institution
for the maintenance and up-keep
of which the Inam was originally
granted. By this arrangement,
the Government is losing annually
a portion of its legitimate income.

9. During the life-time of Muthur
Venkatarumanappa he represented
on 2 or 3 occasions that the resump
tion of this Village by Government
on the mistaken notion that its
was an inam granted to the
temple in the Siddaghatta Kasba,
was illegal, that as the Village was
originally a personal Inam, he
had purchased it from the
Inamdar, and that his possession
might not therefore be disturbed.

The said Venkatarumanappa
is now dead and his son has

Submitted

Submitted Petitions to me stating that if the inam Village were restored to them, they would not only restore the temple at Nanne-mendalli which is now in a state of great disrepair, to its proper condition by executing necessary repairs to it to the extent of Rs 300 but also make proper arrange-ments, satisfactory to Government, for the performance of Puja to the Deity. They further promise to pay to Government the accumulated arrears of quitta amount which accrued subsequent to the date of the assumption of the Village by Government. The statement given to this effect by the son of Sruthur Venkataramaniah is also submitted with the record.

10. This Village is said to be a Archarak one, and the only source of income is its Archakwamee which does

does not even cover the Govern-
ment gutta.

11. As the Village is now being managed by Government at a loss to Government and without any benifit to the institution, I would recommend the restoration of the Village to the sons of the alienee, subject to the conditions above set forth, with a distinct warning to them that the Village would be resumed in the event of their failure to fulfil any of these conditions.

12. The matter was brought to my notice when I was at Siddaghatta and from the enquiries made by me on the spot, I am satisfied that the Inam Village was wrongly attached and may now be restored to the sons of the alienee.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient Servant,

W Whitehead

Asst Deputy Commissioner
Kolar

Mysore 816

Read again:—

Govt. Pro: No. 718 dy 17th December 1897 directing the cancellation of the unauthorized alienation of the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Sidlaghatta, and the assumption of the management thereof by the Mysore Department.

Also Read:—

Petition No. 288 dy 24th September 1901 from Mr. Hiriyur Venkatramana Gy complaining against the assumption by Govt. of the management and praying for restoration to

of the income endowed
to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple
at Kammasandra in
the Siddaghatta Talk

Read also:—

The following letter
No 1534-157 dy 31st August 1904
from the Dy Commr Kolar
District reporting on
the above:—

" In explanation

Order thereon:— No: 2380 / M:7:46-98. dy 4th Jany. 1905

The Govt are pleased
to approve of the action
taken by the Dy Commr
in regard to the four shops
now in the Chandrasandra village
endowed to the Sri Anjaneyaswami

Kolar 04

temple in Kasba Sid as a

which is in accordance

with the direction given

in the in Proceedings of the

19th December 1897 read above

2. From the Deputy

Letter of the 28th August 1900

read above and from the

Inam File dealing with

* Page 2 and D)
+E

and 12, dated 5th

January 1872 and 18th October

1880 respectively, the Court

observe that four villages

not in the Chowdaram Taluk

village and the hamlet

village of Kamanakatti in

both in the Srikakulam

Taluk, were confirmed

as Devadaya in the

and that the Rayacoty village of Hanumanhalli in the said Taluk
was conferred to
the Sri Ranganayakaswami
temple in the village of
Hanumanhalli in the Sidlaghatta
Taluk. A
mistake was made by the
Inam Commissioner in considering
them as one village and that the
four Sri Vaishnava and the Rayen
-ga village referred to
above were all endowments
to the Sri Ranganayakaswami
temple at Sidlaghatta Kasba,
evidently because the
names of the two deities
of the two temples were
identical. In the light
of the fact as now brought to
notice

and the present Dy/com^r reports that the village of Hanumanhalli should not have been affected by Govt when dealing with the affairs of the Sidlaghatta Ranganayakaswami temple.

notice by the Govt
(Mr K. P. Puttanna (Rtd Hd
the Govt are pleased to
direct the rectification ~~rectify~~ the error
3. The Govt are satisfied
that the Kayemgutta village
of Hanumenhalli endowed
by the Sri Anjaneya-
temple in that village
has not been brought
by the institution during
the period that the village
has been under Inam
They are accordingly
pleased to
direct the
re-assessment to
the village

alienee Venkatanarayanappa,
subject to the conditions
detailed in the Commissioner's
letter read above. The arrears
amounting to
~~Rs~~ Rs 49-10-9 ~~only~~
~~due by~~ being the Sutta
still due by him should
be recovered from the
sons of the alienee who
should also be warned
that they would be
~~will~~ evicted from
the possession of the inam
village, if they do not carry
out the repairs needed to
the satisfaction, and make
satisfactory arrangements
for the performance of

Papers in the case.

The D.G. Commission is requested to fix a period within which the repairs should be completed and the other conditions fulfilled and report the result to the Govt.

[illegible signature]

for the Minister Rehab.

Submitted.
May this be printed.

[illegible]

[illegible signature]
22.XII.04

[illegible]

The D.G. Comm.

[illegible]

READ AGAIN—

Government Proceedings No. 718, dated 17th December 1897, directing the cancellation of the unauthorized alienation of the inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Sidlaghatta and the assumption of the management thereof by the Muzrai Department.

READ—

Petition No. 288, dated 24th September 1901, from Muthur Venkatramanayya, complaining against the assumption by Government of the management, and praying for the restoration to him of the inam endowed to the Anjaneyaswami temple at Hanumenahalli in the Sidlaghatta Taluk.

READ ALSO—

The following letter No. 1534—157, dated 31st August 1904, from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, reporting on the above.

With reference to your docket No. 104—46-98, dated 13th July 1901, calling for a report regarding the assumption of the management of the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple and its Inam lands at Sidlaghatta, and subsequent Nos. 581 and 1736, dated 16th October 1901, and 7th May 1902, respectively, requesting to submit the entire records connected with the case for the disposal of a memorial received from the alienee, Muttur Venkatramarappa, I have the honor to submit herewith the entire records connected with the case, from which it will be seen that the needful repairs to the Anjaneyaswami temple at Sidlaghatta have been executed as per estimate sanctioned in your docket No. 622, dated 30th November 1899 and that pooja is being regularly performed therein.

2. As regards the assumption of the management of the Inam lands attached to the temple which were alienated by the archaks, it is now reported that out of four Survey Nos. in the Chowdasandra village assigned as Inams to the temple at Sidlaghatta, Survey No 151 having been alienated prior to Chief Commissioner's Notification dated 31st January 1853, it has since been subjected to a jodi of half the assessment which is now being paid to the institution direct, and that the remaining three numbers have been resumed from the aliences and restored to the temple and that they are now under Government management in accordance with Government Order No. 718, dated 17th December 1897.

3. In this connection I beg to bring to your notice that from the beginning a mistake has been made with regard to the Kayamgutta village of Hanumenahalli, which is also under attachment and management of Government.

4. There were two Anjaneyas' temples, one in the Sidlaghatta kasba, and the other in the village of Hanumenahalli which is at a distance of two miles from Sidlaghatta. One and the same pujari was performing puja in both these temples and was enjoying the Inam lands endowed to both. Some time ago a pujari of these temples seems to have alienated these lands.

5. Hanumenahalli is a Kayamgutta village endowed to the temple of Anjaneyaswami at Hanumenahalli village and not to that at Sidlaghatta kasba. A kind perusal of the title-deed No. 146—12, dated 18th October 1880 (filed in the record as Serial No. 40), will show that this village was confirmed as Kayamgutta village in favor of the temple of Anjaneya devaru at Hanumenahalli. In the printed copy of the Quit rent Register, it is noted that this inam was originally a personal one, but subsequently treated as "Devadaya."

6. As these facts were not known at the time when this office reference No. 3479—827, dated 3rd March 1897, was made, it was recommended by the then Deputy Commissioner that this village also might be brought under Government management, probably under the belief that it was an inam village endowed to the temple at Sidlaghatta. The Government have accordingly passed orders and the same is now under Government management along with the other lands of the temple at Sidlaghatta.

7. How this mistake arose it is not possible to say at this distance of time, but it might be rightly inferred that as both the temples were dedicated to the deity of the same name and as one pujari was performing puja in both the temples, the authorities, without holding proper enquiries in the matter might have included this village also as one endowed to the temple at Sidlaghatta. If the Taluk authorities had taken pains to see the Inam Title-deeds and the Quit-rent Register, this mistake would not have crept in. Whatever might have been the cause of this error, it is a mistake which has now to be rectified in the light of the facts now brought to notice.

8. Before the resumption of this village by Government, it was in the possession and enjoyment of Mathur Venkatramanappa in whose favor the archak had alienated the village, and he was paying to Government a gutta amount of Rs. 24 per annum; but subsequent to its resumption, the annual income of the village does not even cover the Government dues, as will be seen from the fact that a sum of Rs. 49-10-9 is still due to Government in the shape of gutta amount for the period during which it has been under Government management. This is neither advantageous to Government, nor of benefit to the institution, for the maintenance and up-keep of which the Inam was originally granted. By this arrangement the Government is losing annually a portion of its legitimate income.

9. During the life time of Mathur Venkatramanappa he represented on two or three occasions that the resumption of this village by Government on the mistaken notion that it was an inam granted to the temple in the Sidlaghatta kasba, was illegal, that as the village was originally a personal inam, he had purchased it from the Inamdar, and that his possession might not therefore be disturbed. The said Venkatramanappa is now dead and his son has submitted petitions to me, stating that if the inam village were restored to them, they would not only restore the temple at Hanumenahalli which is now in a state of great disrepair, to its proper condition by executing necessary repairs to it to the extent of Rs. 300 but also make proper arrangements, satisfactory to Government for the performance of puja to the deity. They further promise to pay to Government the accumulated arrears of gutta amount which accrued subsequent to the date of the assumption of the village by Government. The statement given to this effect by the son of Muthur Venkatramaniah is also submitted with the record.

10. The village is said to be a becharak one, and the only source of income is its Hullubannee which does not even cover the Government gutta.

11. As the village is now being managed by Government at a loss to Government and without any benefit to the institution, I would recommend the restoration of the village to the sons of the alienee, subject to the conditions above set forth, with a distinct warning to them that the village would be resumed in the event of their failure to fulfil any of these conditions.

12. The matter was brought to my notice when I was at Sidlaghatta and from the enquiries made by me on the spot, I am satisfied that the inam village was wrongly attached and may now be restored to the sons of the alienee.

No. 2330—Muz. File No. 46-98, dated Bangalore, 7th January 1905.

Order thereon.—The Government are pleased to approve of the action taken by the Deputy Commissioner in regard to the four Survey Nos. in the Chowdasandra village endowed to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple in the kasba Sidlaghatta which is in accordance with the direction given in their Proceedings of the 17th December 1897 read above.

2. From the Deputy Commissioner's letter of the 31st August 1904, read above and from the Inam Title-deeds Nos, 242 and 12, dated 5th January 1872 and 1st October 1880 respectively, the Government observe that four Survey Nos. in the Chowdasandra village of the Sidlaghatta Taluk, were confirmed as "Devadaya" inams to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple in kasba Sidlaghatta and that the Kayamgutta village of Hanumenahalli in the said Taluk was confirmed to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple in the village of Hanumenahalli in the Sidlaghatta Taluk. A mistake is now reported to have been made by the then Deputy Commissioner in considering

Muzrai, dated 7th January 1905.

that the four Survey Nos. and the Kayamgutta village referred to above were all endowments to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Sidlaghatta kasaba, evidently because the names of the two deities of the two temples were identical and the present Deputy Commissioner reports that the village of Hanumenahalli should not have been attached by Government when dealing with the affairs of the *Sidlaghatta* Anjaneyaswami Temple. In the light of the facts now brought to notice by the Deputy Commissioner (Mr. K. P. Puttanna Chetty) the Government are pleased to direct the rectification of the error.

3. The Government are satisfied that the Kayamgutta Inam village of Hanumenahalli endowed to the Sri Anjaneya Swami Temple in that village has not been beneficial to the institution during the period the village has been under Government management. They are accordingly pleased to sanction the Deputy Commissioner's recommendation to restore the village to the sons of the alienee, Muthur Venkatramanappa, subject to the conditions detailed in the Deputy Commissioner's letter read above. The arrears amounting to Rs, 49-10-9 being the gutta still due to Government should be recovered from the sons of the alienee who should also be warned that they would be evicted from the possession of the inam village, if they do not carry out the repairs needed to the institution and make satisfactory arrangements for the performance of puja in the temple. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to fix a period within which the repairs should be completed and the other conditions fulfilled and report the result for the information of Government.

Draft

Secretary, Muzrai Department.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, returning records.

Exd.—C. S.

1904-05

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 7th January 1905.

No. 2380
M. F. 46-98

Passing orders in the matter of the restoration of the Inam Lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneya swami Temple at Hanumenahalli in the Sidlaghatta Taluk.

SBP—4-2 05-200



Rec'd 11/3/07

Replies

11/3/07

Despatched Recorded

dated

11/3/07

1906-7

SC7

From

C Srikanteswara Aiyar Esqr
B.A., B.L.
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore, Munsai Depts.

Dated 8th March 1907

Despatched

Received

General No. 1393.

No.

Enclosure No.

Reports on the affairs of Kayamgutta Hanumenahalli in the Siddaghatta Tq after its restoration to the heirs of the late alienee - Muthur Venkataramanappa, as called for in Govt Proc No Mucy 2380, dated 7th Jany 1905

M.F. 46-98

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,

Kolar District.

No_____ Dated Kolar, 8th March 1907.

From

C. Srikantesvara Aiyar Esquire, B.A.,B.L.,

Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

To

L. Anantaswami Rao Esquire, B.A.,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Muzrai Department.

Sir,

With reference to the concluding portion of para 3 of Government Proceedings No, Muz 2380/m.F.46-98 dated 7th January 1905, calling for a report re the affairs of Kayamgutta Hanumenahalli in the Sidlaghatta Taluk, after its restoration to the sons of the late alienee Muttur Venkataramrnappa, I have the honor to state that it has been reported by the Amildar of the said Taluk that the arrears of gutta amount referred to in the Government Proceedings under advertance together with the gutta for the year Khrodi have been recovered and credited to the Treasury, that repairs to the temple of Sri Anjenaya swami amounting to Rs, 250/ have been satisfactorily executed, and that proper arrangements have been made to conduct the worship of the Temple once in a week

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obeidient servant.

For Deputy Commissioner.

Kolar District.

cp 16/3

Mysore

SLP

Read:— Govt. Pro. no 2380
Mus 746-98

dy 7th Jan. 1905 passing orders in the matter of the restoration of the inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Hanumenhalli in the Sidlaghatta taluk.

Letter no 6393 dy 8th March 1904 from the Dy Commr., Kolar dt reporting that as directed in the Govt. Pro read above the arrears of Kuttadamount

have been recovered
and credited to the Treasury,
that repairs to the temple
amounting to Rs 250/- have
been satisfactorily executed
& that proper arrangements
have been made to conduct
the worship in the temple
once a week.

— a —

Order thereon. No. 4613 8/20.3.07

Recorded

19/3/07

13/7/07 Secy Mun Deptt

To, Medy comm: Kolar Dt